

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
: MEMORANDUM DECISION
IN RE: : AND ORDER
:
TERRORIST ATTACKS ON :
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 : 03 MDL 1570 (GBD) (SN)
:
-----X

This document relates to:

Accardi v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 21-cv-06247
Alexander v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 21-cv-03505 *Amin*
v. Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 20-cv-00412 *Anderson v.*
Islamic Republic of Iran, No. 20-cv-00354 *Betso v. Islamic*
Republic of Iran, No. 21-cv-01394

GEORGE B. DANIELS, United States District Judge:

Certain *Accardi*, *Alexander*, *Amin*, *Anderson*, and *Betso* Plaintiffs moved for partial final default judgment against Defendant Islamic Republic of Iran (“Iran”) on behalf of Plaintiff victims of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (the “9/11 Attacks”). (Mot., ECF Nos. 9766, 9770, 9776, 9995.)¹ These Plaintiffs largely belong to two categories: (1) the estates of people who developed chronic and ultimately fatal medical conditions after 9/11-related exposures (“Latent Injury Decedents”); and (2) the immediate family members of those who died from these latent injuries and illnesses linked to the 9/11 Attacks (“Surviving Family Members”).

Before this Court is Magistrate Judge Sarah Netburn’s February 28, 2025 Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that this Court: 1) grant the motions for partial default judgment brought on behalf of the Latent Injury Decedents and awarding them pain and suffering damages; 2) deny the motions for partial default judgment sought by the Surviving

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all ECF citations included herein refer to documents filed on the 9/11 multidistrict litigation docket. *See In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001*, No. 03-md-1570 (GBD)(SN).

Family Members; 3) grant the motion for partial default judgment brought on behalf of 9/11 decedent Gene Maloy and awarding his estate \$2,000,000 in pain and suffering damages and his spouse \$12,500,000 in solatium damages; and 4) award Plaintiffs listed in Exhibits A, B, C, D, and E prejudgment interest at a rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001, until the date of the judgment. (Report, ECF No. 10755, at 17; Order, ECF No. 10769.) Because the *Accardi*, *Alexander*, and *Betso* Plaintiffs filed timely objections to the portions of the Report recommending denial of partial final default judgment by the Surviving Family Members, (Objs. (“Objections”), ECF No. 10803), this Court undertakes a *de novo* review of that portion of the Report. The Court reviews the unobjected portions of the Report for clear error. Having done so, this Court ADOPTS the Report in its entirety.

I. LEGAL STANDARDS

A court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations” set forth in a magistrate judge’s report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The court must review *de novo* the portions of a magistrate judge’s report to which a party properly objects. *Id.* However, the district court need not conduct a *de novo* hearing on the matter. *See United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 675–76 (1980). Instead, it is sufficient that the district court “arrive at its own, independent conclusion.” *Nelson v. Smith*, 618 F. Supp. 1186, 1189–90 (S.D.N.Y. 1985) (citation omitted).

Portions of a magistrate judge’s report to which no or “merely perfunctory” objections are made are reviewed for clear error. *See Edwards v. Fischer*, 414 F. Supp. 2d 34, 346–47 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (citations omitted). Clear error is present only when “upon review of the entire record, [the court is] left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *United States v. Snow*, 462 F.3d 55, 72 (2d Cir. 2006) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

II. MAGISTRATE JUDGE DID NOT ERR IN DETERMINING JURISDICTION, AND IRAN'S DEFAULT AND LIABILITY

The Court has both subject matter and personal jurisdiction over Iran under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act ("FSIA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1602 *et seq.*, and Iran defaulted. (*See* Report at 4–6.) Magistrate Judge Netburn correctly stated that Iran's liability must be evaluated under the six elements of 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c): Plaintiffs must be (1) U.S. citizens or their personal representatives bringing claims (2) against a designated state sponsor of terrorism (3) that provided material support for (4) "an act of torture, extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, or hostage taking" (5) causing (6) personal injury or death. (*Id.* at 6 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(a)(1),(c)).) Magistrate Judge Netburn also correctly determined that Plaintiffs' claims "easily meet five of these six elements," but that they must demonstrate "proximate cause[.]" (*Id.* at 7.)

A. Latent Injury Decedents

The Latent Injury Decedents establish proximate cause through the "substantial factor" and "reasonable foreseeability" tests. (*Id.* at 8–10.) Representatives for decedents provided Victim Compensation Fund ("VCF") eligibility determination letters noting any illnesses triggered by the 9/11 Attacks, and affidavits attesting to death from the specified illnesses. (*See Accardi* Decl., ECF No. 9768; *Betso* Decl., ECF No. 9773; *Alexander* Decl., ECF No. 9778.) Furthermore, most decedents provided "Award Detail" letters from the VCF which demonstrate that a doctor found that the condition was caused by 9/11-related exposures and further, that the 9/11-related condition was the cause of death. (*Id.*) The evidence shows that Iran's actions were a "substantial factor" in the sequence of events that led to" the decedents' latent injuries. (*See* Report at 8–10 (citation omitted).) Further, this Court previously held that it was "reasonably foreseeable" that, as a consequence of Iran's material support to al Qaeda for the 9/11 Attacks, the unsafe environment created by carcinogens from building materials and jet fuel would result in latent, and potentially

fatal, injuries.” *In re Terrorist Attacks on Sept. 11, 2001*, No. 03-md-01570, 2023 WL 5109691 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 9, 2023) (“Latent Injury I Opinion”), at *2. Thus, the Latent Injury Decedents have demonstrated proximate cause and are entitled to relief.

B. Surviving Family Members

1. The Court’s Previous Rulings

The causal link between Iran’s actions and the Surviving Family Members’ injuries, however, is far too attenuated. Proximate cause requires a “direct relation between the injury asserted” and the alleged conduct. *Holmes v. Sec. Inv. Prot. Co.*, 503 U.S. 258, 268 (1992). In the case of Surviving Family Members’ injuries, this Court explained that “the chain of causation is far too long to constitute proximate cause.” *Latent Injury I Opinion*, at *2. Therefore, the Report correctly concluded that Surviving Family Members failed to establish proximate causation. (Report at 12.)

As Magistrate Judge Netburn noted, when evaluating the Surviving Family Members’ requests for solatium damages from their immediate family members’ latent injuries and illnesses, courts have looked to the discussion of common law Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (“IIED”). *Raanan v. Binance Holdings Ltd.*, No. 24-CV-697 (JGK), 2025 WL 605594, at *11 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2025). Under the elements for IIED claims in the Restatement (Second) of Torts, in order to grant their requests, the Court must find that “al Qaeda ‘intentionally or recklessly caused’ the injuries [the Surviving Family Members] suffered when their immediate family members died of a 9/11-related injury.” (Report at 11.) Such a finding would potentially create an indefinite scope of liability, allowing an unlimited class of indirect plaintiffs to make claims. *Latent Injury I Opinion*, at *2. Therefore, the Court concludes, as it did before, that Iran is not liable to the Surviving Family Members for latent injuries.

2. Surviving Family Members' Additional Arguments

The Surviving Family Members present three additional arguments in their instant motions. (See Mem. of Law in Support of Mot., ECF Nos. 9767, at 20–22; 9771, at 20–22; 9777, at 21–23.) First, they point directly to the terrorism exception under § 1605A, arguing that “family members of a decedent may recover solatium damages for ‘the mental anguish, bereavement, and grief . . . as well as the harm caused by the loss of a decedent’s society and comfort.’” (Mem. of Law in Support of Mot., ECF No. 9767 at 20 (quoting *Dammarell v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 281 F. Supp. 2d 105, 196 (D.D.C. 2003), *vacated on other grounds*, 404 F. Supp. 2d 261 (D.D.C. 2005)).) However, as the Report correctly noted, this Court has previously held that Plaintiffs failed to establish proximate causation under § 1605A, and their argument here does not alter this conclusion. (Report at 13, citing *Latent Injury I Opinion*, at *8.)

Secondly, the Surviving Family Members argue that “a VCF award of Non-Economic Losses to spouses and dependents of a deceased victim is akin to an award of solatium damages under FSIA §1605A.” (Mem. of Law in Support of Mot., ECF Nos. 9767, at 20–21; 9777, at 21–23.) They further argue that the VCF draws no distinction between spouses and dependents of those who died in the 9/11 Attacks and those who died from latent injuries. (Mem. of Law in Support of Mot., ECF Nos. 9767, at 21; 9777, at 22.) Again, the Surviving Family Members run into the challenge of demonstrating causation. The VCF’s criteria for providing compensations, different from the framework under § 1605A, do not persuade this Court to change its conclusion on this score.

Lastly, as to the Surviving Family Members’ foreseeability argument, the Court previously adopted Magistrate Judge Netburn’s opinion that “[e]ven if their injuries were foreseeable,” the chain of causation connecting Iran’s actions to the Surviving Family Members’ harms “is far too

long to constitute proximate cause.” *Latent Injury I R&R*, at *8 (internal citation omitted); *Latent Injury I Opinion*, at *2. For the same reasons, the Court reject this argument as well.

3. Surviving Family Members’ Objections

In their objections, Surviving Family Members argue that the Court’s concern for creating a potentially unlimited class is not warranted because the class is strictly limited to immediate family members. (Objs. at 10.) Here, Surviving Family Members misunderstand Magistrate Judge Netburn’s and the Court’s reasoning. As the Court explained before, the concern for “indefinite scope of liability” stems from the ability of “indirect plaintiffs related to current and future latent injury decedents” to assert solatium damages. *Latent Injury I R&R*, at *2. Because latent injuries will continue occurring, the Court would not be able to cabin future liability multiple decades after the 9/11 Attacks. *See Davis v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 882 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2012) (it would be against Congress’s intention for FSIA § 1605A(c) if plaintiffs born after the terrorist attacks could seek to recover decades after a terrorist attack).

Regarding foreseeability, Surviving Family Members cite facts of the severe health consequences suffered by victims who were exposed to the “environmental assault” resulting from the 9/11 Attacks. (Objs. at 11–12.) The Court recognizes the significant injuries to Latent Injury Decedents and the emotional harm to the Surviving Family Members, but the prevailing legal framework does not lead to a conclusion that the chain of causation is strong and direct enough for the Surviving Family Members to obtain solatium damages from the latent injuries suffered by the Latent Injury Decedents.

Lastly, Surviving Family Members argue that the VCF awards non-economic damages to dependents of Latent Injury Decedents, and the compensation will be “on account of personal physical conditions, physical injuries or death.” (Objs. at 12–14.) This is not a new argument and

as Magistrate Judge Netburn explains, essentially agreeing with Surviving Family Members, that the VCF compensates “non-economic losses sustained by the victim, and the victim’s spouse and dependents, *because of* the victim’s death as a result of the September 11th aircraft crashes or subsequent debris removal.” (Report at 14.) This fact alone does not support the conclusion that the 9/11 Attacks are a direct cause of the Surviving Family Members’ emotional distress. Their long-term pain cannot be considered a direct result of the 9/11 Attacks.²

Therefore, because the Surviving Family Members’ previous and new arguments failed to establish proximate causation, Iran is not liable for solatium damages requested by the Surviving Family Members. (Report at 15.)

III. MAGISTRATE JUDGE NETBURN DID NOT ERR IN DETERMINING PAIN AND SUFFERING DAMAGES FOR PLAINTIFFS

On February 7, 2020, Magistrate Judge Netburn established a framework to award personal injury damages to individual Plaintiffs who had sustained injuries during the 9/11 Attacks, which this Court adopted on February 14, 2020. (Report and Recommendation (“Personal Injury Report”), ECF No. 5879, *adopted by* Mem. Decision and Order, ECF No. 5946.) This framework outlined the personal injury awards for individual Plaintiffs as follows:

Category of Injury	Pain and Damages Award
Significant	\$5,000,000
Severe	\$7,000,000
Devastating	\$10,000,000

² The Surviving Family Members also provide a different interpretation of *Kinsman Transit Co. v. City of Buffalo*, 388 F.2d 821. (2d Cir. 1968) and object to Magistrate Judge Netburn’s reliance on this case. (Objs. at 15–16.) The Court adopts a de novo review of the portion of Magistrate Judge Netburn’s decision denying the Surviving Family Members’ claims and does not base its decision on *Kinsman* here. The Court does not need to consider the Surviving Family Members’ argument that *Kinsman* is not applicable to their claims.

(Mem. Decision and Order, ECF No. 5946, at 3.) In the Personal Injury Report, Magistrate Judge Netburn defined and categorized what types of injuries this Court will typically consider to be “significant,” “severe,” or “devastating.” (Personal Injury Report at 6–9.) Magistrate Judge Netburn reserves the Court’s discretion to award further upward departures in what appears to be exceptional circumstances. (*Id.* at 6.)

Here, Magistrate Judge Netburn properly applied this framework to the Latent Injury Decedents for their comparable injuries, awarding their estates awards of pain and suffering damages as set forth in Exhibits A, B, C, and E. (Report at 16; Order, ECF No. 10769.) The personal representatives of the Latent Injury Decedents submitted documentation and declarations wherein they extensively detailed the injuries sustained by the Latent Injury Decedents, establishing a causal link between the injuries and the 9/11 Attacks. (*See Accardi Decl.; Betso Decl.; Alexander Decl.*) Each decedent identified in Exhibits A, B, C, and E of the Report suffered a latent injury triggered by the 9/11 Attacks. Magistrate Judge Netburn did not err in recommending the baseline award for Latent Injury Decedents. (Report at 16.) Further, she appropriately found that Plaintiffs should also be awarded “prejudgment interest of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually from the period from September 11, 2001, until the date of judgment.” (Report at 17.)

IV. 9/11 DECEDENT GENE MALOY

Gene Maloy’s estate seeks \$2,000,000 in pain and suffering damages on his behalf, while his spouse seeks \$12,500,000 million in solatium damages. (Mot., ECF No. 9776.) This Court previously held in *Havlish I* that the “9/11 Attacks were caused by [Iran’s] provision of material support to al Qaeda.” *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001*, No. 03-md-1570, (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 22, 2011) (“*Havlish I*”) at *41. Therefore, Magistrate Judge Netburn correctly concluded

that Iran is liable to Mr. Maloy. (Report at 16.) An award of \$2,000,000 in pain and suffering damages to his estate and an award of \$12,500,000 in solatium damages to his spouse are proper. (*Id.*)

V. *AMIN AND ANDERSON* PLAINTIFFS

Three *Amin* and *Anderson* estates have already secured liability judgments against Iran but were granted leave to refile because they lacked living personal representatives. (Report at 16–17 (citing *Latent Injury I R&R*, at *10 (finding liability); Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 9216 (recommending denying their motions with leave to refile), *both adopted by Latent Injury I Opinion*.) Now that the *Amin* and *Anderson* estates have properly filed requests for damages and substituted new personal representatives, this Court awards them each \$7,000,000 in pain and suffering damages.

VI. CONCLUSION

The motions for partial default judgment brought on behalf of the Latent Injury Decedents are GRANTED; the motions for partial default judgment brought by Surviving Family Members are DENIED; and the motion for partial default judgment brought on behalf of 9/11 decedent Gene Maloy is GRANTED. It is

ORDERED that partial default judgments are entered on behalf of the Latent Injury Decedents identified in Exhibits A, B, C, and E against Iran; and it is

ORDERED that a partial default judgment is entered against Iran on behalf of 9/11 Decedent Gene Maloy; and it is

ORDERED that Plaintiffs identified in Exhibits A, B, C, and E be awarded pain and suffering damages as set forth therein; and it is

ORDERED that the spouse of 9/11 Decedent Gene Maloy be awarded solatium damages as described in this Order; and it is

ORDERED that Plaintiffs receiving damages identified in Exhibits A, B, C, D, and E are awarded prejudgment interest of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually, running from September 11, 2001, until the date of judgment; and it is

ORDERED that Plaintiffs may submit future applications for punitive or other damages at a later date consistent with any future rulings of this Court.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the motions at:

- ECF Nos. 9766, 9770, 9776, and 9995 in 03-md-1570.
- ECF No. 64 in 21-cv-6247
- ECF No. 70 in 21-cv-1394
- ECF No. 74 in 21-cv-3505
- ECF No. 106 in 20-cv-0412
- ECF No. 100 in 20-cv-0354

Dated: March 27, 2025
New York, New York


SO ORDERED

GEORGE B. DANIELS
United States District Judge

Exhibit A

Personal Representative					9/11 Decedent							Claim Information		Pain & Suffering Damages	
	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	Nationality on 9/11	Date of Death	9/11 Site	Case	Complaint	Amount	Notes
1	Jill Robin		Accardi Mundy-Sutton		William		Mundy		U.S.	10/19/13	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 1 21-cv-06247, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	Jill Accardi and Robin Mundy-Sutton are Co-Executors of William Mundy's Estate.
2	Matthew Robert Kristin	B.	Blair Blair Folberth	Jr.	Robert		Blair		U.S.	12/6/17	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 1 21-cv-06247, 1 at 1 21-cv-06247, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	Matthew B. Blair, Robert Blair, Jr., and Kristin Folberth are Co-Executors of Robert Blair's Estate.
3	Gloria		Finegan		Patrick		Finegan		U.S.	11/7/14	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	
4	Denise		Grossarth		Glenn		Grossarth		U.S.	12/3/16	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	
5	Caroline		Lodewyks		Matthew		Lodewyks		U.S.	1/6/18	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
6	Pamela		Mahoney		Kevin	P.	Mahoney	Sr.	U.S.	2/15/18	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
7	Michele		McLean		Hernan		McLean		U.S.	11/12/09	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
8	Doreen		Morstatt		Joseph	A	Morstatt		U.S.	3/5/16	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
9	Kathleen		Nerney		Kevin	P	Nerney		U.S.	12/18/15	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
10	Marian		Pennachio		James		Lanza		U.S.	4/6/17	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
11	Genevieve		Sharp		William		Sharp		U.S.	3/26/17	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	
12	Josh		Weismer		Diane		Pillersdorf		U.S.	5/1/12	NY	21-cv-06247	21-cv-06247, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	

Exhibit B

	Personal Representative				9/11 Decedent							Claim Information		Pain & Suffering Damages	
	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	Nationality on 9/11	Date of Death	9/11 Site	Case	Complaint	Amount	Notes
1	Evelyn		Betso		James		Betso		U.S.	6/17/15	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 1	\$7,000,000	
2	Amy	L.	Bosche		Christopher		Bosche		U.S.	9/12/17	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 1	\$7,000,000	Formerly Amy L. Christian
3	Maria		Castro-Morales		Gregorio		Morales		U.S.	7/30/16	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 1	\$7,000,000	
4	Paula		Cohen		Ronald		Cohen		U.S.	11/25/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 1	\$7,000,000	
5	Maryrose		DeNunzio		James		DeNunzio		U.S.	3/2/13	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 1	\$7,000,000	
6	Joanna		Dixon-Reisman		Steven	B.	Reisman		U.S.	6/1/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	Claimant's name was misspelled as Johanna on the original complaint
7	Karen		Gaines		Scott	N.	Gaines		U.S.	9/27/17	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	
8	Liam		Greaney		Thomas		Greaney		U.S.	1/5/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	
9	Cheryl		Hafner-Zawada		Stephen	L.	Zawada		U.S.	11/23/12	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 2	\$7,000,000	
10	Sandra		Heffernan		James		Heffernan		U.S.	12/1/13	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
11	Patricia		Kalbouros		Kevin		Czatoryski		U.S.	12/5/10	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
12	Steven		Lakeman		Georgetta		Lakeman		U.S.	11/17/16	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
13	Melissa		Lawson		Roger	C.	Steinert		U.S.	6/2/17	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
14	Bonnie		Malloy		Brian	C.	Malloy		U.S.	3/28/11	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
15	Stephen		McCarey		Eugene		McCarey		U.S.	11/13/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
16	Jennifer		McNamara		John	F.	McNamara		U.S.	8/9/09	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 3	\$7,000,000	
17	Ari		Meisel		Elisabeth		Temin		U.S.	2/14/11	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
18	Bessie		Mercado		David		Mahmoud		U.S.	11/11/10	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
19	Lisa		Quick		William		Quick		U.S.	1/18/11	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
20	Rosalie		Ragucci		Raymond		Ragucci		U.S.	9/4/11	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
21	Tresa		Roth		Robert	M.	Roth		U.S.	3/16/08	VA	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
22	Laura		Runco		Robert		Runco		U.S.	12/20/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
23	Patricia		Stines		James		Stines		U.S.	3/17/14	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 4	\$7,000,000	
24	Virginia		Sullivan		Lawrence	J.	Sullivan		U.S.	8/20/12	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	
25	Nakia		Torres		Walter		Torres		U.S.	12/18/12	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	
26	Denise		Trapani		Franco		Trapani		U.S.	12/4/10	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	
27	Katherine		Ventriglia		Robert	J.	Ventriglia		U.S.	11/2/10	NY	21-cv-01394	21-cv-01394, 1 at 5	\$7,000,000	

Exhibit C

	Personal Representative				9/11 Decedent						Claim Information			Pain & Suffering Damages	
	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	First	Middle	Last	Nationality on 9/11	Date of Death	9/11 Site	Case	Complaint	Amount		Notes
1	Raymond		Alexander		Robert		Alexander	U.S.	8/14/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 1	\$7,000,000		
2	Robert		Anderson		Carl	P.	Anderson	U.S.	8/26/14	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 1	\$7,000,000		
3	Lucia		Aurello-Beauchamp		Charles		Aurello	U.S.	6/22/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 1	\$7,000,000		Listed as Lucia Beauchamp-Aurello in Complaint
4	Gloria		Browne-Marshall		Ernest		Marshall	U.S.	12/5/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 1	\$7,000,000		
5	Anna	R.	Byrnes		Kevin	R.	Byrnes	U.S.	2/4/04	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 2	\$7,000,000		
6	Lawrence	M.	Byrnes	Jr.	Lawrence	M.	Byrnes	U.S.	6/14/15	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 2	\$7,000,000		
7	Patricia		Byrnes		Joseph	L.	Battaglia	U.S.	8/5/09	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 2	\$7,000,000		
8	Donna		Canari		John		Canari	U.S.	12/15/15	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 2	\$7,000,000		
9	June	Murphy	Carrozza		Francis		Carrozza	U.S.	1/11/15	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 2	\$7,000,000		
10	Lynn		Casey		Peter		Casey	U.S.	7/3/13	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 3	\$7,000,000		
11	Jean	Marie	DeBiase		Mark		DeBiase	U.S.	4/9/06	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 3	\$7,000,000		
12	Anne		Dierking		Ronald		Wolken	U.S.	3/4/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 4	\$7,000,000		
13	John		Dimor		Donna		Hersh	U.S.	8/7/11	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 4	\$7,000,000		
14	Mary		Eikeseth		Leif	Evan	Eikeseth	U.S.	3/15/19	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 4	\$7,000,000		
15	Sara	Lea	Elarat		Marcos		Elarat	U.S.	12/30/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 4	\$7,000,000		
16	Denise		Flanagan		Peter		Flanagan	U.S.	2/3/12	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 4	\$7,000,000		
17	Elizabeth		Garcia Roman		Richard		Lopez	U.S.	6/24/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 5	\$7,000,000		
18	Martha		Gless		Robert		Gless	U.S.	10/25/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 5	\$7,000,000		
19	Gwendolyn		Hanlon		Kevin		Hanlon	U.S.	8/25/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 5	\$7,000,000		
20	Lynn		Hansell-Perkins		Gary		Perkins	U.S.	6/19/19	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 5	\$7,000,000		
21	Barbara		Hanson		Harold		Hanson	U.S.	3/26/19	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 5	\$7,000,000		
22	Jody		Hawkes		Robert		Hawkes	U.S.	10/22/13	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 6	\$7,000,000		
23	Keisha		Henderson		Auriel		Henderson	U.S.	12/28/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 6	\$7,000,000		
24	Elizabeth		Horne		Cornell		Horne	U.S.	10/5/14	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 6	\$7,000,000		
25	Gresy		Johnson		Stephen		Johnson	U.S.	11/28/10	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 7	\$7,000,000		
26	Leigh	Anne	Jones		Charles		Jones	U.S.	1/29/13	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 7	\$7,000,000		
27	Hillary		Katzman		Howard		Katzman	U.S.	4/27/14	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 7	\$7,000,000		
28	Joan		Lalicata		Salvatore		Lalicata	U.S.	1/14/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 7	\$7,000,000		
29	Winston		Lewis		Charles		Williams	U.S.	7/10/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 7	\$7,000,000		
30	Carolyn		Mansberger		James		Mansberger	U.S.	8/1/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 8	\$7,000,000		
31	Lee	Ann	Mazzillo		Robert	B.	Mahon	U.S.	4/8/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 8	\$7,000,000		
32	Jennifer	Lynn	Mendizza		Rod		Mendizza	U.S.	11/1/18	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 9	\$7,000,000		

33	Sheif		Mesiha		Karen		Mesiha	U.S.	12/12/15	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 9	\$7,000,000	
34	Jean		Meyerowitz		Andrew		Libo	U.S.	10/25/11	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 9	\$7,000,000	
35	Anna		Murray		Edward		Murray	U.S.	2/24/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 9	\$7,000,000	
36	Margaret		O'Hanlon		Michael		O'Hanlon	U.S.	8/28/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 9	\$7,000,000	
37	Chantal		Paultre		Jacques		Paultre	U.S.	6/24/08	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 10	\$7,000,000	
38	Margaret		Randazzo-Maloy		Gene	Edward	Maloy	U.S.	9/11/01	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 10	\$2,000,000	The only Decedent killed in the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks.
39	Neelam		Silhi		Louis	G.	Bryan	U.S.	11/7/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 10	\$7,000,000	
40	Brittany		Smith		Daniel	G.	Smith	U.S.	2/7/16	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 10	\$7,000,000	
41	Jane		Tuohy		Joseph		Tuohy	U.S.	11/8/17	NY	21-cv-03505	21-cv-03505, 5 at 11	\$7,000,000	

Exhibit D

[illegible]

Exhibit E

Personal Representative					Claimant						Claim Information			Pain & Suffering Damages		
	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	Nationality on 9/11	9/11 Site	Case	Complaint	Amendments & Substitutions	Documentation	Amount	Notes
1	Lauren	Ann	Fischer		Michael	F.	Shipsey		US	NY	20cv00354	20cv00354,11 at 15	9992	8356, 8356-3, 8356-4, 8356-15 at 2	\$7,000,000	R. & R. at ECF 8901, adopted at ECF 9274, recommended damages sought here, but death of prior Personal Representative required substitution and re-filing, see R. & R. at ECF 9216, adopted at ECF 9274.
2	Florence		Hoosein		Rebecca	A.	Buck		US	NY	20cv00412	20cv00412, 13 at 11	9992	8375, 8375-3, 8375-4 at 8, 8375-13 at 6	\$7,000,000	R. & R. at ECF 8901, adopted at ECF 9274, recommended damages sought here, but death of prior Personal Representative required substitution and re-filing, see R. & R. at ECF 9216, adopted at ECF 9274.
3	a) Jill b) Robin		a) Lynch b) Rossi		Roberto	Carlo	Rossi		US	NY	20cv00412	20cv00412, 13 at 15	9992	8375, 8375-3, 8375-4 at 68, 8375-14 at 12	\$7,000,000	R. & R. at ECF 8901, adopted at ECF 9274, recommended damages sought here, but death of prior Personal Representative required substitution and re-filing, see R. & R. at ECF 9216, adopted at ECF 9274.